

SECRET

21 June 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Comments on Enthoven TOD Memorandum of 16 May 68 to DepSecDef

1. This memorandum is to identify the areas of agreement and difference between DoD/SA and DCI/NIFE/TOD Staff relative to the comments and proposals made in Mr. Enthoven's memorandum to Mr. Nitze. It identifies specific points which should be considered in more detail in any future joint effort between DoD and DCI to agree on a concept for continuation of the TOD exercise. The items are taken up in the sequence in which the points were raised in Mr. Enthoven's memorandum.

2. The statement is made in para. 1, p. 1 of subject memorandum that the DoD data were submitted to the DCI member of the TOD Committee in January and February 1968.

Comment. This is not correct. Our incoming mail records show:

a. No DoD data were received in January.

b. The data from Mr. Flax's organization were received in full on 19 February, but partially revised by the submitter in March.

c. The data from General Carroll's program was received between 27 February and 12 March. Partial revisions were received on 20 March. As indicated in subject memorandum, para. 3, p. 1, some data on MC&G were still to be received by DoD from the Services when Mr. Enthoven's 16 May memorandum was written, and to the present time we have not received from OSD/SA this revised information on some 4-5 Reporting Entities.

d. The data on General Carter's program were not received from OSD/SA until 1 April 1968. An unsatisfactory initial submit had been made by the agency involved to OSD/SA early in 1968, but this was returned to be almost wholly revised, and no data whatsoever were made available from OSD/SA to DCI on this program prior to 1 April.

3. Enthoven memo, para. 5, p.3: OSD/SA proposes that there be an identification of DoD program resources according to the missions of the U.S. intelligence organizations, as follows: Warning; Order of Battle; Tactical Support; Technical Support; and MC&G.

SECRET

SECRET

Comment. There is merit in part of this proposal. The existing community TOD structure can be modified to accommodate this general idea.

At present, it appears to us that the proposed "warning" subdivision is undesirable. There is no unique type of information which fits the "warning" category; rather, all kinds of information may contribute to providing warning depending on many circumstances. As a subject target, therefore, "warning" poses difficulties. We think that other alternative subdivisions are more clear and meaningful when identifying the targets of U.S. intelligence.

4. Enthoven memo, para 5, p.3: OSD/SA proposes to obtain TOD data on tactical intelligence activities, which are not included in the Carroll/Carter/Flax programs.

Comment. We agree.

5. Enthoven memo, para 5, p.3: OSD/SA proposes to obtain and display data by the individual military services.

Comment. We agree.

6. Enthoven memo, para. 1, p.4: OSD/SA proposes to obtain and display data on Viet Nam, Korea and Thailand separately.

Comment. We agree, but we would go even further in breaking out additional individual countries.

7. Enthoven memo, para. 2, p.4: OSD/SA notes the importance of trend data. (We agree.) Accordingly, SA proposes to collect data for FY 70 and FY 72.

Comment. We agree on FY 70 and FY 72. However, we believe that a continuous series of years is indispensable, and we recommend that the expansion of TOD be for consecutive years. Hence, we recommend the next data call include FY 69, 70, 71 and 72 (as well as a re-do of FY 68 to develop "year end" information as contrasted to the "program projections" which are included in our present data base for FY 68.

8. Enthoven memo, para 3, p.4: OSD/SA notes the importance of obtaining "actual allocations" after the end of the FY and programmed allocations looking ahead to FYs not yet completed. Hence, SA argues, data for each year must be collected twice.

Comment. We agree.

9. Enthoven memo, para 4, p.4: OSD/SA proposes a new DoD TOD data call which will be less detailed than the original.

SECRET

SECRET

Comment. We disagree on the value of a data call which does not get down to the basic building blocks involved in intelligence resources and organizations. Our proposals for a new data call are being incorporated in the draft TOD report to the Sponsors. They involve an expansion of the present detail. To compensate and attempt to ease the burden on the individual Reporting Entities, we also propose an augmentation of the TOD Staff to "tailor" the data call in different formats for different types of units and activities, while all such tailor-made formats are consistent parts of a single, coordinated and consistent data collection plan.

10. Enthoven memo, para. 4., p. 4.: OSD/SA proposes to eliminate the separate identification of Collection, Processing and Production.

Comment. We totally disagree. The proper balance between Collection, Processing and Production is at the heart of the entire intelligence business. This is of utmost importance.

11. Enthoven memo, para 4., p. 4: OSD/SA comments that the allocation of Manpower to targets has not proven to be useful and hence only total manpower should be identified for each Reporting Entity.

Comment. We strongly disagree. We need to relate manpower to Collection, Processing and Production, and we need to go further in subdividing Manpower, so that we do not equate a professional intelligence officer with an 18 year old GI assigned to some intelligence unit. Total Manpower figures are entirely inadequate to reflect such variations in our U.S. intelligence capabilities.

12. Enthoven memo, para. 4., p. 4: OSD/SA proposes to discontinue the "Investment" and "Expense" subdivisions.

Comment. We strongly disagree. The Investment category needs to be better defined. However, in general it represents present expenditures to develop future capabilities; Expenses in general represent present expenditures for maintaining today's capabilities. A very misleading picture is presented as to the true character of the U.S. intelligence efforts if the changed interrelations of total funds (TOD) -- brought about by changes as between Investment and Expenses -- are not identified.

13. In the implementing memorandum dated 27 May 1968 prepared by OSD/SA and signed by Mr. Nitze, a new, immediate call for TOD data is authorized, with analysis to be completed by OSD/SA by 1 October 1968.

Comment. We strongly disagree for the following reasons:

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

a. This makes practically impossible a subsequent community call, as a result of the work load imposed.

b. This would totally confuse the individual Reporting Entities by conflicting definitions and concepts.

c. Such a call would have to be based on now-existing data -- which due to the program review process is subject to considerable change between now and the time when DepSecDef approves the PCDs of the CIP and CCP in September or October.

d. "Actual" data for FY 68 are not yet available.

In our opinion a preferable data base to be TOD'd is the decisions which DepSecDef will make with respect to the above-mentioned PCDs now coming up through program channels. This is the most authoritative program resources judgment expressed at any time in the Fiscal Year.



25X1

~~SECRET~~